



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,913	12/20/2000	Masaya Wajima	36856.390	5944

7590 09/18/2002

Keating & Bennett LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

740913

Applicant(s)

Wajima et al

Examiner

M. Budd

Group Art Unit

2834

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-19-02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9, 11-15, 18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9, 11-15, 18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 11-15, 18 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda, Wajima or Sugiyama in view of Tsuji or Onishi.

Kuroda, Wajima and Sugiyama teach the piezo-electric resonator except they do not use laminated substrates with integral capacitors. However, Tsuji and Onishi teach mounting piezo-electric resonators on substrates provided as laminated layers incorporating circuit elements in an integral construction. Thus, to provide an very compact self contained piezo resonator as shown by Tsuji or Onishi it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use laminated substrates with Kuroda, Wajima or Sugiyama. Note that once the electric circuit is designed. The physical architecture of the ceramic piezo elements and capacitor electrodes is dictated and thus providing that structure would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The newly added method recitations "liquid-sintered" and "sintered at the same temperature" are not limiting in the article claimed. An article of manufacture must stand or fall on its own merits as it is blind as to how it was produced. The first and second substrates cannot 'know' whether they were sintered at different temperatures or liquid-sintered.


Application/Control Number: 09/740,913

Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

M BUDD/pj

09/17/02


MARK S. BUDD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 212